

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/802,096	03/15/2004	Takeo Oshiba	47539.34	4058
7590 07/28/2006			EXAMINER	
Cameron Kerrigan			GOODROW, JOHN L	
Squire, Sanders	& Dempsey L.L.P.			
Suite 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
One Maritime Plaza			1756	
San Francisco, CA 94111			DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

6) Other:

Application/Control Number: 10/802,096

Art Unit: 1756

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants' use of a mass additive should state where or what such mass additive is in relationship to the photoconductor.

Double Patenting

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6689522.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the same developer composition is used in a similar image forming method and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a weighted cylindrical electrophotographic photoconductor.

Claims 1-19 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 6902856.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the same developer would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a photoreceptor with cylindrical electrophotographic photoconductor.

Application/Control Number: 10/802,096 Page 3

Art Unit: 1756

4. Claim 1 is provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 12 of copending Application No. 10/802452. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claim a photoconductor including an insert in the cylindrical drum.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John L. Goodrow whose telephone number is 571-272-1384. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday -Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark F. Huff can be reached on 571-272-1385. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Soffi L Goodfow Primary Examiner Art Unit 1756